

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 09 2007

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1, 2, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over the Japanese patent document to Koike, et al.

Claims 4, 6, and 7 are considered as generally allowed.

At the same time, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 4, 6 and 7 has been gratefully acknowledged.

In connection with this, claims 4, 6 and 7 have been rewritten in independent form including the features of claim 2 from which they depend, thus making them independent. Claims 4, 6 and 7 are therefore now in allowable condition.

Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled, and claims 3 and 5 have been amended to depend on claim 6. Since they share the allowable features of claim 6, they should be considered as being in allowable condition as well.

At the same time, applicants submitted claims 8-15 which additionally define the present invention and distinguish it from the prior art.

Claim 8 defines a method for blast-cleaning an object embedded in the ground, that includes the steps of providing a truck, an articulated working robot, a distance sensor, a CCD camera, a monitor, an opening floor part, automatically cleaning a glass surface, and blasting a cleaning agent from the blast nozzle by measuring and determining the extent of cleaning based on brightness or light intensity of the object cleaned from an image taken by the CCD camera, with additional details of the respective steps.

Claim 9 defines the system for blast-cleaning with the structural elements substantially performing to the steps of claim 8 and with additional elements. Claim 12 substantially corresponds to claim 9 and additionally defines the extensible cornice with corresponding features.

The reference applied by the Examiner, namely the Japanese patent document to Koike, et al has been carefully considered. This reference does not teach the new features of the present invention which are defined in independent claims 8, 9 and 12.

It is believed that claims 8, 9, and 12 should also be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should also be allowed, together with claims 10-11 and 13-15 which depend on the independent claim 9 and share their allowable features.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,

/ Michael J. Striker /

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233